इसी प्रकार से अभी जब गोधरा में यह घटना घटी तो उसी समय हमने अपने रेल कोच फैक्टरी को यह टॉस्क दिया कि हमें इस प्रकार के डिब्बे बनाने चाहिए कि जिसमें कोई अगर आग लगाना चाहे तो आग नहीं लगे। आज स्थिति यह है कि हम प्रोटो टाइप बनाने की स्थिति में पहुंच रहे हैं - फायर प्रूफ कोचेज के क्योंकि अगर कोई बाहर से आग लगाना चाहेगा तो आग नहीं लगा सके। इसी साल के सितम्बर तक उसका प्रोटो टाइप बनकर तैयार हो जाएगा। मैंने स्वयं आई0सी0एफ0 में जाकर देखा है कि जिस ढंग से फायर रिटारडेंट का इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं कि केरोसिन-तेल में उसको सोख कर दो घंटे रखा गया, फिर आग लगाई गई। उसके ऊपर लगाया हुआ केरोसिन-तेल जल गया लेकिन उसके मेटीरियल पर असर नहीं आया। तो इस प्रकार के मेटीरियल का इस्तेमाल हो रहा है। हर चीज में कार्रवाई हो रही है।

कॉलिजन के लिए एंटी कॉलिजन डिवाइस 3500 किलोमीटर में लगाए जाएंगे। उसके लिए बजट में प्रोविजन किया गया है। इस साल दस हजार किलोमीटर में सर्वे का प्रोविजन किया गया है। कोई एक्सीडेंट होता है तो यह दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण है। लेकिन एक्सीडेंट न हो, उस पर कैसे काबू पाया जाए चाहे कॉलिजन का हो, चाहे डिरेलमेंट का हो -ऑल टाइम नो डिरेलमेंट हो। अब जब हमारे ट्रेक स्ट्रक्चर का हैल्थ इम्प्रूव करेगा, क्योंकि यह कोई एक साल में नहीं हुआ। यह 17 हजार किलोमीटर के करीब ओवर ड्यू रिन्युअल हुआ है। तो यह कई साल की यह बीमारी थी। उस बीमारी को दूर करने के लिए प्रयत्न किया है और 17 हजार करोड़ रुपए का एस0आर0एस0एफ0 बनाया है। तो इस प्रकार से कदम उठाए जा रहे हैं। सरकार की कोशिश है कि दुर्घटनाओ पर हम काबू पाएं और इसके लिए जो भी संभव कदम हैं वे उठाए जा रहे हैं। हर प्रकार से दुनियां में जो टेक्नालोजी उपलब्ध है ब्रिज मेनेजमेंट आदि के लिए उन सब चीजो को अपनाने की दिशा में कदम बढ़ाए जा चुके हैं। हम इतना सदन को आश्वस्त करना चाहेंगे कि सरकार अति गंभीर है दुर्घटनाओं के प्रति, संवेदनशील है और हर प्रकार की जो संभव कार्रवाई है उसके रिन्युअल के लिए की जाती है। लेकिन हम माननीय सदस्यो के कंसर्न को शेयर करते हैं, कोई भी एक दुर्घटना होती है वह हमारी बदनामी का कारण बनती है और हम सब मिल करके इस पर काबू पाने की कोशिश करेंगे।

DISCUSSION ON THE STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER ON HIS RECENT VISITS TO GERMANY, ST. PETERSBURG, EVIAN AND CHINA

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we will take up the discussion on the statement by the Prime Minister, which he made on 24th July, 2003. One-and-a-half hour is being given for this discussion. Prime Minister has a meeting. So, we have to finish it within the stipulated time, or, may be early. So, kindly abide by the time-frame and put pointed questions. Shri Natwar Singh.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to the Treasury Benches for agreeing readily to have a discussion on the Prime Minister's visit to China and several other countries.

He made a statement on the 24th July and we sought a discussion on this important statement. Now, we, on this side, see Prime Minister's visit to China as a continuation of the process started by the former Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, in December, 1988, where he broke a logjam which had lasted far too long and put behind him 1962 and undertook his trail-blazing visit to China. Your Government has come a long way from May, 1998, when, after the explosions at Pokhran on the 11th and 13th May, you wrote to the President of America, Mr. Bill Clinton, that these nuclear explosions were China-centric, that we had two neighbours who were hostile to us, one of them, at that time, was a nuclear power. You did not have to give explanation to the American President; you owe an explanation to the people of India and to the Parliament of India, which was not forthcoming at that time, and a Minister of yours called China as 'enemy number one'. So, what has happened?

SHRI SWARAJ KAUSHAL (Haryana): Who has said that? He never said that. Will you confirm that he ever said that China is enemy number one? You should be very certain about facts... ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I was a Member of the other House when this particular debate took place. I participated in the debate; I spoke in the debate; I opened the debate. You can check the records. If I am wrong, I will take back what I said. Are you satisfied now?

SHRI SWARAJ KAUSHAL: When did he say this? Did he ever say that China is our enemy?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: To the best of my recollection, he has said this. And, if he did not say, I will stand corrected. Now, Madam, through you, I want to know what has happened in these five years? Is it that events in Iraq and Afghanistan have influenced your decision? As you said in Srinagar, what has happened in Iraq and Afghanistan हमारे लिए चेतावनी है। Now we welcome this change in the attitude of your Government towards the People's Republic of China. I have personally some knowledge of Sino-Indian relations. I try my best to keep in touch and abreast of events; and I keep learning each day. I spent a year learning Chinese at Peking University, and China was my first posting over your and a half decades ago. The statement that you made on the 24th is very comprehensive both in letter and spirit. It exudes friendship, warmth and

good neighbourliness, which we welcome. At the same time, Madam, there are elements in this statement and the declaration, which make me seek some clarifications, and, I do so in the spirit of what Mr. Hubert Vedrine, distinguished Ex-Foreign Minister of France and friend of Jaswant Singhji, said:

> "I am convinced that in our era, foreign policy must continually be explained. The public must know how its political leaders look at the world, how they assess the balance of power, and how they see the problems that our foreign policy confronts. The public must know the different options before the country and the reasons for which, at the end of the day, we end up choosing one course of action rather than the other."

Now, Sir, in a document issued by the Ministry of External Affairs, that was distributed to the Standing Committee on External Affairs on 11th of July -- when we were discussing your visit to China -- on page 7, it says,

> "In February, 1979, the then External Affairs Minister Mr. A.B. Vajpayee paid a landmark visit to China".

Now, Sir, on 27th of April, 1989, in this very House this is what he had said.

> "प्रधान मंत्री जी चीन गए थे, पाकिस्तान गए थे। ये देश हमारे पड़ोसी हैं। चीन के साथ हमारे संबंधों का एक बड़ा कटु अध्याय है। मैं स्वयं 1979 में चीन गया था। बातचीत अच्छी हुई मगर उन्होंने उसी बीच वियतनाम पर हमला करके सारी यात्रा पर पानी फेर दिया।"

The External Affairs Ministry calls it a landmark visit. It was an aborted visit; you came back and you said this yourself, "इस बार इस तरह की कोई दुर्घटना नहीं हुई, मुझे संतोष है।"

Mr. Rajiv Gandhi did not have to return because the Chinese did not attack anybody. But when you were there, they did. Now, similarly, with regard to Tibet, in your statement and in the declaration, it is said:

> "On Tibet, I would like to assure this House that there is no change in our decades old policy. We have never doubted that the Tibet Autonomous Region is a part of the territory of the Peoples' Republic of China."

I will come to the various statements that have been made by the various Governments since 1954 on Tibet. But, I would like to say, in the same debate, Madam, the distinguished Prime Minister, the then Leader of the Opposition, said this about Tibet, and, on what Rajiv Gandhi had done on Tibet. On 27th April, 1989, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee said:

> "मैंने उस दिन सलाहकार समिति में भी यह प्रश्न उठाया था कि जब प्रधान मंत्री चीन गए और चीन के नेताओ ने तिब्बत का सवाल उठा दिया तो उन्होंने तिब्बत के बारे मे हमे कुछ कहने का मौका दे दिया। मैं नेहरू जी का प्रशंसक हूं मगर तिब्बत को चीन का अंग मानकर नेहरू जी ने हिमालय जैसी भूल की थी। यह भूल किस कारण हुई, इसमे मै विस्तार से जाना नही चाहता। तिब्बत को भी स्वतंत्र होने का अधिकार है। तिब्बत को चीन का ऑटोनॉमस रीजन माना गया था। आज कहां है ऑटोनॉमी? मानवाधिकारो का उल्लंघन हो रहा है, मार्शल-लॉ घोषित कर दिया गया है, बड़े पैमाने पर दमन है, आतंक है।"

.... and he continued like this. Now, Sir, if you allege Jawaharlal Nehru committed a Himalayan blunder, what blunder have you committed? A celestial blunder? Because, you have extended the language used by Shri Rajiv Gandhi and Shri P.V. Narsimha Rao. Let me bring it to your notice, and, I do so with the utmost respect. I quote from India-China joint communique issued on December 6, 1988: "The Chinese side expressed concern over anti-China activities by some Tibetan elements in India. The Indian side reiterated the longstanding and consistent policy of the Government of India that Tibet is autonomous region of China and that anti-China political activities by Tibetan elements are not permitted on the Indian soil. The India-China joint communique on December 16, 1991, Mr. Narsimha Rao was there, it says and I quote: "The Chinese side expressed concern about the continued activities in India by some Tibetans against their motherland and reiterated that Tibet was an inalienable part of Chinese territory and that it was firmly opposed to any attempt and action aimed at splitting China and bringing about independence of Tibet. The Indian side reiterated its longstanding and consistent position that Tibet is an autonomous region of China and it does not allow the Tibetans to engage in anti-China political activities in India". Declaration on Principles of Relations and Comprehensive Cooperation between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China, 2003, says "The Indian side recognises that the Tibet autonomous region is part of the territory of People's Republic of China. Previously, it was, in 1988, "Tibet is an autonomous region of China"; in 1991, "Tibet is an autonomous region of China"; in 2003, "Tibet

autonomous region is part of the territory of People's Republic of China". I am only concerned with the nuances. Nobody is disputing that Tibet is an autonomous region of China. It has been accepted. I just want to request humbly and respectfully, if the Prime Minister could take the House into confidence, if there is any particular reason for the subtly and the slight change in language because these nuances are important. Number two, I also want to ask because the language used in 1954, was 'Tibet region of China', in 1958 'Tibet region is part of the People's Republic of China and, then, I have quoted the other three. In all previous visits by the Prime Ministers, there were either joint press communiques or joint statements about a particular region for having a Declaration, which was signed by you and your counterpart, Mr. Wen Jiabao.

Now, with regard to Sikkim. In your statement, you were good enough to say that another development of significance is the Memorandum of Border Trade through Nathula Pass on the India-China boundary. This adds the third point of crossing for border trade between India and China. With this memorandum, we also start the process by which the Sikkim would cease to be an issue in India-China relations. I just wanted to ask through you, Madam, from the hon. Prime Minister was it not possible to include Sikkim in the Declaration also? Was there any pressing reason that it was included in the memorandum which was singed, I think, by the External Affairs Minister and the Commerce Minister of China? Was there any exchange of views on this matter? Did we put across to the Chinese, bearing in mind the friendship between us and the Chinese Republic, The Peoples of China, as friends, that it would help matters if Sikkim was included in the Declaration, rather than in the Memorandum? I do not know whether this discussion took place. And if you think that this is something which cannot be declared, I will respect confidentiality because all matters cannot be discussed in the House, but I am sure, the House will be interested, the country will be interested, to know why Sikkim could not be included. I am not even going for reciprocity. I think, the people of Sikkim have welcomed this development..... (*Time-bell*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are two speakers.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I think, this was known that this discussion would take place, and the Prime Minister should have arranged his schedule accordingly.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I go for the time. It is not my decision.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Madam, I beg your indulgence. This is an important matter.

Madam, the people of Sikkim have welcomed this arrangement; I am not critical. I am merely asking why Sikkim was not included in the Declaration.

Then, there was the question of the statement made on Arunachal Pradesh. We know that this incident took place on the 26th of June when the distinguished Prime Minister was in Shanghai. It was made public a little later. Our position on Arunachal Pradesh is well known, and we reject the Chinese contention that Arunachal Pradesh is not a part of India. There is nothing new that they have said. What I am requesting is to throw light on the fact as to why this incident took place at this particular time. I am not attributing any motives. It may be purely accidental because the border has never been demarcated. Now you have appointed your National Security Advisor as the Interlocutor on this, with his Chinese counterpart, and, I am sure, the two sides will agree to have some kind of a criterion on the basis of which the demarcation can begin; maybe, now, or after some time. What I wanted to know was whether it was pure accident. If it was an accident, then, I think, we could have accepted that. But the fact is that this incident does violate the letter and spirit of the 1993 Agreement and the 1996 Agreement. And if you allow, Madam, I will read out the relevant paragraphs because if an accident happens, or if either side crosses unintentionally, then a mechanism is provided in both these Agreements. In the 1993 Agreement, it was laid down:

> "The two sides are of the view that the India-China boundary question shall be resolved through peaceful and friendly consultations. Neither side shall use or threaten to use force against the other by any means. Pending an ultimate solution to the boundary question between the two countries, the two sides shall strictly respect and observe the line of actual control between the two sides. No activities of either side shall overstep the line of actual control. In case personnel of one side cross the line of actual control, upon being cautioned by the other side, they shall immediately pull back to their own side of the line of actual control.

When necessary, the two sides shall jointly check and determine the segments of the line of actual control where they have different views as to its alignment."

In November, 1996, an Agreement was signed. It says:

"While conducting exercises with live ammunition in areas close to the line of actual control, precaution shall be taken to ensure that a bullet or a missile does not accidentally fall on the other side across the line of actual control."

Article VI (4) says:

"If the border personnel of the two sides come in a face-to-face situation due to differences on the alignment of the line of actual control or any other reason, they shall exercise self-restraint and take all necessary steps to avoid an escalation of the situation. Both sides shall also enter into immediate consultations through diplomatic and/or other available channels to review the situation and prevent any escalation of tension".

Now, I don't know, Sir. But the newspaper reports are that the other side came into our territory, their claim is that our people went to that side and our people were disarmed and detained. This violates the spirit of both these Agreements. I am sure, the House would like to know from the Prime Minister whether we conveyed our, what I should say, disappointment at this incident or the manner in which it was handled and, certainly, the abrupt manner in which a pronouncement was made that the People's Republic of China did not recognise Arunachal Pradesh as part of the territory of India.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Your party's time is over, Mr. Natwar Singh.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Having said this, may I, once again, say that we have welcomed your visit to China. We have welcomed the sentiments expressed by both the countries in the Declaration and in your statement where you have said that the friendship between these two countries is good not only to us bilaterally but also for Asia. It is good for

the world peace. It is good for a new international political order, if these two countries see eye-to-eye, which we do on so many issues. Ten agreements have been signed. These will further intensify our relations to the mutual benefit of both the countries. Therefore, you went to China with good wishes of the people of India and I am only hoping, Sir, that some of the clarifications that we have sought will be treated in the spirit in which they have been sought. Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I have to abide by the time because the Prime Minister has a meeting and he has to go. Shri Ramachandraiah. Your party has 5 minutes. Please put your questions. A lot of ground has been covered by Shri Natwar Singh and you can put your questions.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you, Madam. I agree with the Prime Minister that though the Kyoto Protocol has been ratified, the encouragement for clean energy development should be pursued and, if necessary, through incentives and transfer of technologies. Although India is one of the countries which has been committed to the use of renewable energy, much has to be done in this country. I am sure, the Prime Minister would have taken up many unresolved issues of WTO. The major issues, in my opinion, is to prevail upon the developed countries to withdraw the substantial subsidies that are being offered by them to their farmers for agricultural and allied activities so as to enable the developing countries like India to step up their agricultural exports. I personally feel, if it is not done, eventually, we will end up as net importers of even foodgrains also.

I congratulate the Prime Minister for his honesty in saying that the recurrent theme in all his meetings was the commitment of both sides to strengthen the ongoing process of building mutual trust and understanding. Apparently nothing tangible seems to have been achieved. But in all these meetings a commitment has been included. That is a very positive step. It has been stated in the statement that a process had been started by which Sikkim would cease to be an issue in Indo-China relations which has been chronic and recurring issue. I should be frank in saying that the Prime Minister's trip has yielded some, however, small gains on the score. This time, the Chinese came around to state that Sikkim is a problem left over from history. We are certainly happy about it. But doubts continue to

persist in the minds of a vast majority of our people as to whether we have achieved this success in relation to Sikkim, essentially by compromising on Tibet. There is a need for the Government to convince the people of the country that nothing of that sort has been done. What is really paining is that immediately after the conclusion of what was considered as a successful visit, China has made a statement about Arunachal Pradesh and raised this issue which it has been doing for the past five decades. Needless to say, the Government of India should again take up this issue with the Government of China. I personally feel that, on economic front, to pick up trade with China, which is essentially an export-oriented country, is a distant dream. China with all its development, I feel, rather has got a very small domestic market for exports. It is one of the favourite centers for outsourcing for big economies like America and other countries. I have to put it differently. The export element in its economy is very strong and it needs the Indian market as it has been trying for overseas markets; whereas, we are also on the same length. But this is a matter of the future. It is not certain what economic cooperation between the two countries is really feasible and tenable. Nevertheless, efforts have to be put in. I congratulate the Prime Minister for making a *suo motu* statement which has enabled us to discuss this issue. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Nilotpal Basu. You also have five minutes.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): I will not take even five minutes.

At the very outset, let me welcome, on behalf of my party, the initiative taken by the Prime Minister to visit all these countries, particularly China. Now the first question that I am going to put is this. We are in very troubled times, so far as the world is concerned. India is a developing country. We had discussed this issue in connection with 9/11 incident as well as subsequent Iraq war. I think it has been a great tradition in this country that overall foreign policy-making has been marked with a great degree of national consensus and that was, of course, broken during the Pokharan blasts. But, subsequently, we have tried to have certain convergence of ideas. One of these convergence of ideas was on the question that unilateralism is bad for the world in general and particularly so for a country like India. We would like to judge the success of your visit,

hon. Prime Minister, in the light of how far you have been able to utilise this tour to develop the idea of multilateralism. There are certain significant elements in your statement about an emerging scenario because in our assessment after the Iraq war, there has been a significant development in terms of pushing the idea of multilateralism and a whole lot of countries are, in fact, realising that unless the United Nations' system is restored, unless the principle of multilateralism is restored, unless the rule of law is restored at the international level, the developing countries like India face a great degree of problem.

So, from that standpoint, we would like an assessment from you, hon. Prime Minister, as to how far this trip was successful. This is immediately connected with the question as to what extent the co-operation will be there with China on issues related to WTO -- Shri Ramachandraiah has raised it -- because this is another area where I think, there can be a close convergence between the Chinese and the Indian positions because today's world is as much a world of those who are having huge markets than as compared to those who are having the capital to invest in those markets. So, as the biggest markets, there could be areas of agreement which can be identified and then developed and on which there can be a great degree of convergence between the Indian and the Chinese positions. So, from that point of view, what is the progress made?

Thirdly, the other question which we would like to put and on which we, as CPI (M), are particularly happy because the original position, we had taken at that point in time on which we were charged of being traitors, seems to be now the national mood that the border disputes with China will have to be overcome through a process of dialogue. And, some progress has been made in terms of setting up the Joint Working Group. So, could we ask of the hon. Prime Minister: What is the tentative time-schedule? I ask this because very unfortunately, certain new questions have come up which are not really congenial to the process which was indicated in the Joint Declaration in so far as the border dispute question is concerned. So, what could be the tentative time-table?

Finally, Madam, a very small question again. I agree with some of the formulations of Ramachandraiahji. Now, in spite of the fact that there is an apparent assimilatory in our priorities in terms of the economic orientation in the sense that we also want to export and they also want to export, what

could be the areas or sectors where there can be a real convergence and synergy of interests? Say, I.T. is one of the sectors which, in fact, the I.T. and Communications Minister has also elaborated. So, what are the areas where you think there can be some kind of a convergence, including I.T. which is a very good case because their strength is on the hardware sector and our strength is on the software sector. So, apart from I.T., what could be the other areas where you think there can be a durable cooperation between the Indian and the Chinese positions?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri V.V. Raghavan. Now, here, I have a little difficulty because there are only 20 minutes and there are eight names. So, only two-and-a-half minutes to each Member.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Maharashtra) : This is not fair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not my responsibility. The time is allotted in the Business Advisory Committee. I am bound by it.

SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN (Kerala): Madam, we welcome the Prime Minister's initiative in strengthening the trend of multipolar world order together with the great countries, China, Russia, France and Germany. China, Russia, France and Germany together with India can play a very vital role in this crucial international situation today. The multipolar trend is to be strengthened jointly and any force, which wants hegemony in the world affairs, can be challenged by these countries together. That is a very good trend which the hon. Prime Minister has strengthened by his historical visit. The Joint Declaration signed by our Prime Minister and the Chinese Premier is a milestone in the relationship of these two countries.

The joint effort on WTO issues, mobilising all the developing countries for safeguarding their very vital interests, is a very welcome step. That has to be pursued just now; the Cancun Ministerial Conference is to take place. Our Minister, Mr. Shourie, is there; but that is not enough. Very crucial issues, as far as India is concerned, are discussed in these Ministerial meetings. So, this joint effort for mobilising the developing countries to safeguard their vital interests is a welcome step. We must do something more to implement these things.

Madam, it is a very welcome step that a High-Powered Joint Commission has been set up to sort out our boundary issues. There are elements in our country who do not like the relationship between India and China to grow. There are some elements trying to sabotage the growing

cooperation between the two great nations. So, it is up to the hon. Prime Minister to see to it that such elements do not play havoc with the development of this cooperation and friendship between these two nations.

The decision to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the *Panchsheel* is also very welcome. This celebration should be organised in such a way that the Non-aligned Movement is again revived and lead the Movement in working towards a Multi-polar World Order. This is an urgent need.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Madam, the time-limit of two-and-a-half minutes is too less to have a discussion. However, I will try to confine myself to this time-limit. Of course, I can ask some questions only; I cannot really discuss.

Madam, I thank the hon. Prime Minister for the statement he made on 24.7.2003. In another statement referred to in parts (a to d) of Rajya Sabha Starred Question No.63 answered on 24.07.2003, it was mentioned:

> "PM underlined the need to eliminate tariff and non-tariff barriers, especially phasing out all trade- distorting agricultural subsidies, removal of restrictions on the free movement of natural persons for providing services and border access of developing countries to pharmaceuticals".

Madam, this goes without saying that we aspire to do so. Now, this in relation to the hon. Prime Minister's participation in the G-8 Enlarged Dialogue in Evian at the invitation of President Chirac. Incidentally, we observe that these sorts of words are exchanged but, in fact, only the G-8 countries take the advantage. So, what great could come out following the participation of our Prime Minister at Evian meeting of the G-8? That is one.

Secondly, it is very interesting that para 19 of his statement, the Prime Minister says:

> "Premier Wen Jiabao and I agreed that these discussions should be given a new momentum by exploring the framework of a boundary settlement from the political perspective of the overall bilateral relationship".

What surprises me is that the Government of the People's Republic of China has put its senior-most Vice-Foreign Minister as a member in that Joint Commission, whereas we have not placed any political personality to

be there. Instead, we have Mr. Brajesh Mishra, who might have been an astute bureaucrat but I fail to understand what relation he has with the political developments, or, the political ethos of the country. The hon. Prime Minister may kindly explain that.

Madam, kindly excuse me for raising this question. Some of the commentators, leading commentators on foreign affairs, in the recent past, in different periodicals and newspapers are commenting that -- I, of course, personally welcome this sort of efforts on the part of the hon. Prime Minister and the Government of India to promote good neighbourly relations, particularly with the People's Republic of China, with other neighbouring countries of ours, including Pakistan, of course. But, now everything in the Foreign Affairs Department is being regulated by the diktats or the desire -- I should not say 'diktats' as it would be hurting the hon. Foreign Affairs Minister but the desire -- of the U.S. State Department which is omnipresent in the Foreign Affairs Department. I have started believing or I tend to believe so... (Interruptions) omnipresent, not omnipotent. I have also started believing so particularly after the news being published that a person like Ariel Sharon who is responsible for disturbing the entire Central Asia, who is continuously and perpetually attacking the freedom movement of the Palestinians for their democratic aspirations, is being invited to India. I am really very sorry to say this. So, personally, I have started feeling that practically everything is being dictated by the State Department of Washington. I have also started doubting whether some of the postulates of the hon. Prime Minister's visit to China were also articulated by them. That may also kindly be explained by the hon. Prime Minister. Madam, with these words, I conclude. I, perhaps, have taken less than two-and-a-half minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. I think your subject was maths or something else because your calculations are a little wrong.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Maths was also a subject of mine.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You better check your marks. Shri R.S.Gavai.

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (Maharashtra): Madam, at the outset, I extend my thanks to the hon. Prime Minister for making a statement on his foreign visit. I have to seek only a few queries from the Prime Minister. I am not going to make any speech. During the Prime Minister's visit to China, India recognised 'Tibet Autonomous Region' as a territory of the People's Republic of China. My further query is, by referring to Tibet Autonomous

Region, the Government of India has, in a way, accepted Chinese claims that only 'Tibet Autonomous Region' is the real Tibet, whereas the truth is that after occupying Tibet in 1949-50, China took away two of the three provinces of Tibet, namely, Kham and Amdo and assimilated them into adjoining Chinese provinces of Sichuan, Yunnan and Ganzu, Qinghai and Kanlho. I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister as to what is the policy of the Government of India on the rest of Tibet, which is outside the Tibet Autonomous Region. Does it mean that the Government of India has given up other parts of Tibet permanently?

Madam, my final query is, whether the Government of India is aware of the fact that a week after Prime Minister's return to India, China has decided to help Pakistan with Rs.30 million to start a third nuclear power plant. I mean to say, China continues to support and provoke Pakistan against India in all possible manner. If China continues to use Pakistan as a proxy against India, how can the Government of India hope to improve relations with China? Thank you very much.

श्री बशिष्ठ नारायण सिंह (बिहार) : उपसभापति महोदया, प्रधान मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य के बाद दूसरी बार इस सदन में उनकी यात्रा के संबंध मे विचार-विमर्श हो रहा है। यद्यपि कई सवाल पूछे गये हैं और उनकी यात्रा के बाद कई टिप्पणियां भी आई हैं। मैं मानता हूं कि हाल के वर्षो मे अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंचो पर भारत ने जितने जानदार और शानदार तरीके से अपने पक्ष को रखा है, उससे भारत की वैदेशिक नीति की सफलता जाहिर होती है। प्रधान मंत्री जी की इन चार देशों की यात्रा में न केवल वैदेशिक मोर्चे पर बल्कि व्यापारिक और अन्य मुद्दों पर भी भारी सफलता मिली है और भारत के पक्ष को विदेशो मे समझाने मे बड़ी सहायता मिली है। मैं मानता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इधर हाल के वर्षों में जो प्रयास किया है, उसकी सफलता का मूल्यांकन आज के समय में तो सही ढंग से नहीं किया जा सकता लेकिन आने वाले वर्षों में किया जा सकता है - उसका असर भी होगा। लेकिन एक दो सवाल दिल और दिमाग मे उठते हैं और लगता है कि उन सवालो पर भी साफ दृष्टि आ जाए और मन मे जो शंकाएं पैदा होती हैं, उनका हल हो जाए तो यह बहुत अच्छी बात होगी। दस वर्षों के बाद चीन की यात्रा, और वार्ता के लिए पाकिस्तान के साथ रास्ता खोला जाए, यह अपने आपमे एक बहुत बड़ी सफलता है। भारत के पड़ोसी देशो के साथ भारत के संबंध अच्छे हो जाएं तो शायद आने वाले वर्षों में जो महाशक्तियां कहलाने वाले देश हैं, उनको इन देशो मे हस्तक्षेप करने का मौका भी समाप्त हो जाएगा। इस दिशा मे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सोच समझकर तथा भविष्य को दृष्टि मे रखकर ऐसी पहल की है, यह बहुत बड़ी बात है। लेकिन एक चीज हम जानना चाहते हैं। इसी देश में, तिब्बत के सवाल पर दलाई लामा जी रहे हैं और मानवाधिकार के सवाल, ऐट्रोसिटीज के सवाल, तिब्बती लोगों के जीवन की शैली - ये न केवल भारतीय परिधि के अंतर्गत उन्होने उठाने का काम किया है बल्कि विश्व के मंचो पर भी उठाने का काम किया है। क्या इस बार की यात्रा, यद्यपि फॉरेन मिनिस्टर और प्रधान मंत्री जी की भी बात स्पष्ट रूप से आ गयी है कि तिब्बत के स्टैंड पर हमारा कोई परिवर्तन नहीं आया है लेकिन पीस के सवाल पर और ह्यूमन राइट्स के सवाल पर श्री दलाई

लामा जी ने इतने वर्षों तक जो भी भारत में रहकर, न केवल भारत में बल्कि विदेश के स्तर पर काम किया है, क्या उस पर किसी स्तर पर कोई आंच तो नहीं आने वाली है? एक बात के लिए मैं इस बार बधाई देना चाहता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने ब्यूरोक्रेटिक मोर्चे से की जाने वाली वार्ता को राजनायिक टेबल पर पूर्णतः लाकर एक बड़ी सफलता हासिल की है, शांति का एक नया दरवाजा और वार्तालाप का नया दौरा खोज दिया है इसके लिए मैं उन्हें बधाई देता हूं और यात्रा में जो सफलता मिली है, उसके लिए बधाई देकर अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Madam, I wish to express my deep sense of unhappiness, and personal anguish. For really forty years, I have heard the statements of Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. I have heard his speeches in Parliament. I have read about them. I have watched his political movements with great interest and great reverence. I admired him, I adored him. I projected him as a colossus. My regret is that I don't find that Atalji in this statement, at all. If within two and a half minutes I have to put questions, may I formulate my questions?

Mr. Prime Minister, I want to ask you. Have you forgotten all that you said before you became the Prime Minister on the subject of China? Do you want the nation also to forget that? May I remind you that there is a binding resolution of both Houses of Parliament in 1967, five years after the ignominious defeat? You opposed extension of the 1962 emergency. You told this House and you asked in rhetorical terms, "have you forgotten the sacred pledge which we have taken in 1962?" Today, I want to ask you, have you forgotten the sacred pledge which you were reminding others about it in 1967? I want to be a friend of China. I want India and China to become as thick friends as is possible. I want this phenomenon to take place as early as possible. I welcome all efforts. Indeed in your visit, you should have talked about this whole area becoming a nuclear free zone. We should get rid of our nuclear armaments -- India Pakistan, China and even other Asian countries. Of course, we must develop friendly relations; but, Mr. Prime Minister, not at the cost of national honour and dignity. Tell this House that our case on China or against China was flawed. I am one of those who in 1962 said, "There is something wrong with the Indian case." But at that time we were dubbed as being some kind of anti-national people that we were not supporting the cause of the country. But I think we were right. There is a flaw in our case. And if there is a flaw in our case, please, have the moral courage to stand up and say to the world that we were wrong and let those resolutions be modified. The problem of this border settlement is a very easy problem. Go to the International Court of Justice; tell them to appoint a commission of experts. Let both sides go to

the commission, present their case and whatever the decision comes, we should gracefully accept it. By the Constitution of this country, you are bound by a Directive Principle to have all international disputes settled by arbitration. Not arbitration, go to adjudication. Find some group of responsible people, impartial people, independent people who can sit and resolve this problem. But you are wasting your time by appointing groups of officers, exchanging maps and in high sounding words, you merely tell us that they are still determining some of kind of mechanisms which do not exist, which are in the air. Your Security Advisor, who is now going to handle this affair, I do not know what he knows about security at all. A person who could not keep a plane, an Indian Airlines Plane in Amritsar which led to the ignominious phenomenon of my very, very dear friend going all the way like a laundry man to give home delivery of those terrorists who were all sanitized, bagged, cleaned up and we went and delivered them in Kandahar. What is this Security Advisor? This Security Advisor knows nothing about security. For God's sake give it in better hands. Thank you.

श्री शंकर राय चौधरी (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : उपसभापति महोदया, मुझे कोई सवाल नहीं पूछना है। मैं आपके मार्फत से माननीय, आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी से कुछ कहना चाहता हूं। महोदया, एक कहावत है, बहुत पुरानी कहावत है कि "शादी और दोस्ती बराबर वालो में होती है"। आज जब हम चीन की तरफ अपनी दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ा रहे हैं तब हमें इसका खयाल रखना चाहिए। क्या हम और चीन बराबरी के दर्जे मे हैं या नहीं हैं? हम लोगो को इस सवाल का जवाब अपने दिल के अंदर, अपने आपसे पूछना पड़ेगा और फिर आगे बढ़ना पड़ेगा। मैं मानता हूं कि जहां बराबरी नहीं है, वहां दोस्ती नही हो सकती, वहां समझौते हो सकते हैं। समझौता हुआ है और मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी को बधाई देता हूं कि वे इस नाजुक मौके पर, जहां उन्हें काफी अहतियात से, दबे पांव, दबी जबान से जो कुछ कहना था, उन्होंने वह बहुत अच्छी तरह से किया है। महोदया, इतिहास एक बहुत कठोर शिक्षक है। चीन के साथ हमारा पुराना इतिहास ह्वेन्सांग और फाह्यान का है तो एक नया इतिहास भी है। यह नया इतिहास 1950 से शुरू होता है। हम जब चीन के साथ समझौते कर रहे हैं तब लाजिमी है कि 1950 से आगे वाला इतिहास हमे भूलना पड़ेगा लेकिन उसका एक हिस्सा और है अगर वह भूल गए तो हम बड़ी गलती करेंगे। वह है 1963 में चीन और पाकिस्तान के बीच जो समझौता हुआ है, जिसके तहत चीन ने पाकिस्तान को हर किस्म की मदद देकर-नॉर्थ कोरिया और चीन ने हर किस्म की मदद देकर-अपना एक उपग्रह बना दिया है, सैटेलाइट बना दिया है, जो कि हमको संभाल कर रखे और बाकी चीन अपना काम करता रहे। यह उनका नेशनल इन्टरेस्ट है और वे इस तरफ बढ़ रहे हैं। चीन के भी दो पहलू हैं। एक पहलू, जिसके साथ माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी अपने चीन सफर में मिले हैं और जिसके तहत 10 एग्रीमेंट साइन हुए हैं। उनके साथ हमारा व्यापार बढ़ गया है और बढ़ रहा है। उनके साथ हमारे कल्चरल कांटैक्ट्स होंगे, टैक्नोलोजीकल कांटैक्ट्स होंगे। यह बहुत अच्छी बात है और यह होना चाहिए। लेकिन दूसरा पहलू हमारे सामने नहीं आता है। पाकिस्तान की तरह हमें ...(व्यवधान)...

5.00 p.m.

उपसभापति : आप जरा टाइम का ध्यान रखेंगे।

श्री शंकर राय चौधरी : आधा मिनट। पाकिस्तान की तरह हमें यह पता होना चाहिए कि चीन की सरकार में पीपुल्ज़ लिबरेशन आर्मी का बहुत ज्यादा हाथ है और चीन के प्रधान मंत्री, चीन के प्रेज़ीडेंट के साथ हमारे प्रधान मंत्री मिले हैं। वे यंग्ज़मिन साहब से भी मिले हैं, जो चाइनीज़ मिलिट्री कमीशन के अध्यक्ष हैं और चाइनीज़ कौंसिल के सीनियर मैंबर हैं। इसलिए जब हम चीन के साथ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाते हैं तो ये सब चीज़े याद रखते हुए बढ़ाएं।

आखिर में मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी को दोबारा बधाई देते हुए, एक और कहावत बताऊंगा, लेकिन इस दफा अंग्रेज़ी में- speak softly, but carry a big stick. यह स्टिक हमारे पास नहीं है। धन्यवाद।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yashwant Sinha, would you like to intervene now?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA): Yes, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. I have got three more speakers before me.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Thank you Madam Deputy Chairperson. I am grateful to the cross-section of this House for having responded so enthusiastically to the outcome of the visit of the hon. Prime Minister to China and to the other three countries in Europe.

Madam, naturally, most of the discussion has been confined to the outcome of his visit to China. But, the hon. Prime Minister, as he did in his statement, also referred, in detail, to his visit to Germany, to Russia, particularly St. Petersburg, and to France for the Evian Summit. The European leg of his tour was equally fruitful because with Germany we were able to, once again, establish the tradition of annual visits at the highest level and the invitation that the hon. Prime Minister extended to the German Chancellor and his acceptance of that invitation would prove that we wish to continue the summit-level exchanges even in future. Our relations with Germany have grown substantially over a period of time, specially the economic part of the relationship, and there is also a great deal of political understanding on the international and regional issues between Germany and India and this was the nature of discussion that the hon. Prime Minister had with Chancellor Schroeder.

In St. Petersburg, it was an occasion to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the founding of that city. The Indian Prime Minister, Madam, was among the forty-one other Heads of States who were invited along with two international organisations. I am quite sure that the hon. Members, in this House, have not lost sight of the fact that at the dinner, which was hosted by President Putin, the Prime Minister of India was seated on a table where other participants were, apart from the host, namely, President Putin; the President of USA; the outgoing and incoming President of the European Union. This was a distinction; this was an honour, which was bestowed on the Prime Minister of India, on Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, in his personal capacity, as well as, on the great country, called, India.

Madam Deputy Chairperson, I have had the opportunity of accompanying the Prime Minister on many of his trips, and I can say without any fear of contradiction that the Prime of India, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, is now internationally recognised as 'A Man of Peace'. He is respected; he is honoured, because they know that he is genuinely interested in peace. Recent initiatives, which the hon. Prime Minister has taken, are substantial and overwhelming proof of that.

With respect to China, Madam Deputy Chairperson, I am grateful especially to Mr. Natwar Singhji for having lent support to the visit, and the results achieved during the visit. He has raised a few questions. I will endeavour to reply to a few of them. The first thing that I would like to say is that at this point of time, in our history, let us not indulge in the credit-taking game, because if we indulge in credit-taking game, then, the blame game will also equally start. So, let us not go into the history of India-China relations, who did what at what point of time. The fact of the matter is that the Prime Minister of India went to China after a gap of ten years. And, in this particular visit, we achieved results, which could only be described as landmark results, substantial results, path-breaking results, which will definitely take the relations, between these two countries, forward.

Of course, the world has changed after Iraq and Afghanistan episodes. The hon. Prime Minister was quite right in referring to it in his Srinagar speech, and his other speeches, conversations and dialogues that he has had. I think, nobody will disagree with the fact that we are living in a world which is different. Therefore, a Foreign Policy is not frozen in time, it is not static. If it is dynamic, then, the Foreign Policy has also to change along with time, along with developments at the international level.

The visit of 1979 of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, as a Foreign Minister, then, was a first contact, at a very high level, between China and India, after 1962. And, the importance of that visit arises from that. Let me also take the House, Madam, through you, into confidence and say that when the Prime Minister was in China, in meetings after meetings, it was the Chinese interlocutors, who kept referring to his 1979 visit, and reminding him of the dialogues that he had in Beijing at that point of time. There have been statements in the past, but there is a continuity in Government. Policies don't change. Agreements, covenants, are not disregarded or thrown into waste paper basket only because Governments change. That, certainly, is not the tradition of great countries; that is not the tradition of India. Therefore, while we are in Government, we are bound to honour all that has been done by the previous Governments. Agreements between two countries have to be respected until they are annulled by the methods prescribed. I would like to take a minute of your time, Madam, to point out here that what we have said on Tibet is something which did not begin in 1988. It started in 1954. Between India and China, there was an Agreement of trade and intercourse between Tibet Region of China, and India in 1954. What did we say in that Agreement? We said... ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I read this out.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: No, you did not read this out.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: No, I read this out. You did not hear it. It said, "...being desirous of promoting trade and cultural intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India..." etc. etc. I read it out. It was the first item on my paper.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Okay; okay. I will take it. Then, I will not repeat what Mr. Natwar Singh has said. ...*(Interruptions)*... We said in 1954, "...being desirous of promoting trade and cultural intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India and of facilitating pilgrimage and travel by the peoples of China and India." Then we went on to give the other parts of the Agreement. Then, did you quote the 1958 Agreement?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Yes, I did.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: You did. This was a note sent by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of China in India. And there, we said, and I quote. "The Government of India recognises that Tibetan Region

is part of the People's Republic of China." The point to note is, we talked about the Tibet Region in both these formulations without talking about the autonomy of Tibet. After that, there was a change in 1988 when Shri Rajiv Gandhi went to China. Then we talked about Tibet as an Autonomous Region of China, and that formulation has continued with very minor variations. And that was the position which has been reflected in the Declaration which the Prime Minister signed with the Chinese Prime Minister. Now, why was there a Declaration? This was the question which Mr. Natwar Singh raised. There have been joint statements and there have been communications. Why a Joint Declaration to be signed by the Prime Ministers of the two countries? Only in order to emphasise the importance of that occasion, the Chinese and the Indian sides, both took the Prime Minister's visit to China as a very serious business. And when you have the serious bilateral business, you try and reach an agreement at the highest level. And by signing the Declaration, the two Prime Ministers have, in effect, given this importance to the visit, and this has happened, as is well-known, Madam, for the first time, that a declaration has been signed. And why a declaration has been signed? It is a comprehensive declaration. It is not merely relating to border, to Tibet or anything. It is a comprehensive document which talks about the aims, the objectives, of this declaration, the long-term objectives of the relationship between the two countries, and goes on to talk about a whole lot of economic issues. Mr. Ramachandraiah was talking about the WTO. Mr. Nilotpal Basu was talking about the WTO and the convergence or the complementalities of the two economies. I am sure, the House is aware, because there is a document in public domain, Madam, that both Governments have agreed to appoint an Expert Group of Economists and the concerned Government Officials. To do what? To do exactly this which Mr. Nilotpal Basu has mentioned, to study complementalities of the two economies so that the future policy and the future direction of our relationship could be systematically determined.

On WTO, there is a great deal of convergence and our Commerce Minister, Madam, is already on record, having said that in his discussions, at multilateral forums, as well as at the bilateral level in Beijing, when he was accompanying the Prime Minister, there was a great deal of convergence of views between China and India. And, I am quite sure, that in the Ministerial which is taking place in Montreal now, and the Ministerial which is going to take place in Cancun, this convergence between China and India is going to play a very very important role in determining the outcome of this Ministerial

visit. Now, Mr. Natwar Singh also raised the issue of why Sikkim was not included in the Declaration. Because Sikkim and Tibet are not linked. There was no question of linking; I mean, we didn't want to tell them because we are saying so on Tibet; therefore, you say this on Sikkim. Sikkim came in only because we signed a Border Trade Memorandum with them which flows or emerged out of the earlier agreements; and-- when you say-- when both sides say 'Sikkim State' we are referring to Indian State of Sikkim quite clearly, I mean, we can't be referring to a Pakistani State; we can't be referring to a Myanmarese State, when we are talking of a Sikkim State. That was the reason why the Prime Minister said in his Statement to this House that it is not going to be an issue. There will be more to follow.

Madam, now the Chinese Statement about Arunachal Pradesh and I will be done with this. Clearly, I mean this is something which is well known that we have a difference of opinion with regard to our boundary. We have a difference of perception even with regard to the Line of Actual Control. Therefore, with regard to what we consider to be our boundary, with regard to what we consider to be the Line of Actual Control, we often send our patrols into those areas and if there are differences, then, the Chinese patrols also come. There was no premeditation. There could not have been, because they didn't know that we were going to send our patrol into that area on the 26th. They could not have, therefore, planned this to embarrass the Prime Minister of India and ensure that the gains of his visit were lost. So, let us not connect it with that at all. It was a stray incident. Such sporadic incidents do take place; and as Mr. Natwar Singh, Madam, has quoted, there are agreements on how the people, the forces should conduct themselves in case they come face to face. We have a feeling that the Chinese patrolling party did not honour that particular agreement. Therefore, we have brought it to the notice of the Chinese Government through their Embassy here. We have also received their reply which is under our consideration, and we will take further steps with regard to the facts as we see them. Therefore, Madam, I would like to say that some of the things which have been raised about this having happened deliberately with a view to embarass the Prime Minister are not correct.

Now, one more point which I would like to make is that as far as Tibet is concerned, the House is aware that what should be the autonomy of Tibet; what should be the range of that autonomy; what should be the relationship between Tibet and China, is something which third parties are

not going to settle. This is something which will be settled between His Holiness Dalai Lama and the Chinese Government. I am happy and I am sure the House is aware that they are already in touch with each other and those discussions are going on. But it has been the Government of India's policy ever since His Holiness Dalai Lama came to India and as is reiterated in all the agreements which have been read out here by Shri Natwar Singhji that we regard him as a spiritual leader, as a religious guru and no Government has so far permitted Indian territory to be used for political purposes by the Tibetans here and that is the reiteration which we made while in Beijing. So, all in all, Madam Deputy Chairperson, there is no difference in this House. As far as Mr. Ram Jethmalani is concerned, I am sure the Prime Minister will, in his reply, be covering the points that he has raised, but, as far as this House is concerned, this House, I take it, is fully behind the Prime Minister in his peace initiative, just as this House is fully behind the Prime Minister in his peace initiative with Pakistan. This has been an outstanding visit; this has been a landmark visit and I have no doubt, Madam, that with the initiatives which have been taken up between China and India, not only in the economic field, not only in the cultural field, but also in the political field, where the boundary question is outstanding, we will be able to make progress in future at a much faster pace than has been the case in the past. Thank you.

SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN (Nominated): Madam, I have no questions because my hon. friends have asked them all, but we all have our own opinions on how the Government conducts its policy at home, and we all vociferously express it here in this House. But, I believe that when the Prime Minister goes around the world and meets world leaders, the Prime Minister goes on behalf of the entire country, and, therefore, I say with utmost respect to some of my hon. friends, I believe, that this is neither the time nor the occasion for polemical speeches, or, searching questions. It is, I believe, a time for congratulations. The Prime Minister having made so many personal contracts with so many Executive Heads of State in a couple of months, speaks volumes for his leadership and his energy. He has said in his statement that he has reason to be satisfied with the result of his visit. I personally feel that he has done us proud, and I would like to say so. Our country, by this visit, has been projected successfully as a major player in world affairs. As an Indian citizen, not aligned to any political party, I would like to thank the Prime Minister for his statement on his visit abroad. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI SWARAJ KAUSHAL: Madam, my friend, in fact, senior friend, Mr. Jethmalani, is never soft; and, if he is soft, its not Jethmalani. But, today, his comments were rather harsh. I am sitting here on the Opposition benches, and we have seen and observed Mr. Jaswant Singh for good five years now. We have seen him interacting with Mr. Colin Powell, and my request to Mr. Jethmalani will be, we should not judge this man only by one fact, only by one incident. I believe, he has been one of the ablest External Affairs Ministers of this country, and this country should be proud of him. Now, I have a question -- the External Affairs Minister could recall -- regarding Shanghai-5. Madam, the Charter of Shanghai-5 is to fight terrorism, separatism, and the five countries who are members of Shanghai-5 decided to share intelligence and undertake joint operations, and their Charter includes not only fighting terrorism but also to fight separatism. And, this naturally interests us a great deal, Madam. And, Madam, there has been a demand for broadening the membership of Shanghai-5

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

to include India, Iran and Uzbekistan. And, Sir, President Putin in a couple of his observations has been advocating that the membership of Shanghai-5 should be broadened to include India, Uzbekistan and Iran. In the last meeting of Shanghai-5, Mr. Chairman, Uzbekistan was present as an observer. Now, my question to the hon. Prime Minister is, did you discuss about broadening the membership of Shanghai-5 to include India? If so, what was the response of the Chinese leaders?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa): Mr. Chairman while congratulating the hon. Prime Minister on his visit to the four countries, I would seek two clarifications. On the return of the hon. Prime Minister from China this incident has taken place in Arunachal Pradesh. And I can say with full responsibility that the report of this incident in Arunachal Pradesh was leaked by our own intelligence agencies to the Press, more specifically by RAW. Now, if the purpose was not to negate the gains of this visit, as the Foreign Minister says, if the purpose was not to embarrass the hon. Prime Minister, then, may I know from the Government, what was the purpose of the Intelligence agencies specifically the RAW, releasing and leaking this information to the Press.

Secondly, the hon. Foreign Minister has spoken of how this Declaration on Principles for Relations and a Comprehensive Cooperation between the two countries is so very important. Now, the point made

almost at the outset, in this declaration is that China and India agree to strengthen multi-polarity at the international level. This is being repeated, both in the meetings at the highest level with the Chinese leaders, and with the Russian leaders. This is being repeated to the point that Mr. Primakov, who came here as Foreign Minister and then as the Prime Minister, spoke about the strategic triangle of Russia, China and India. Now, the point is this : are our words and deeds in consonance or are they opposing each other? Because, I have here, Sir, a report of 18th of July in the *People's Daily* of Beijing, which is the main organ in Beijing and also an organ of the Party there, on 'US dreams of Asian NATO'. And I am quoting, from the report of Beijing -- and this has been reported also in the media worldwide -- "In the eyes of the United States, India holds an important strategic position, linking the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean." Now, this is important, "Talks between Pentagon senior advisers and their New Delhi counterparts were held in late May on the prospects for a new security system for an **Asian version of NATO**."

"A Pentagon report recommended that the United States should construct a long-term alliance with India to contain Washington's potential Asian adversaries, and particularly China." This has all been reported by the World Press also. And then, Sir - I quote again, "Washington's basic purpose for closer ties with India and an **Asian version of NATO** is to extend its status as the world's sole superpower." Now, General Myers, who is the Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff, the topmost man in the Defence establishment, came here just last week.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please, conclude.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Yes, Sir. General Myers came here. Now what is the purpose of this strategic partnership? The question I am asking is this, Sir : Are we, the people of India, to become the foot soldiers of the American Empire? Are we to revert to the colonial status, this time, not as part of the British Empire, but as a colony or a semi-colony of the American Empire? I want clarifications from the hon. Prime Minister on these two matters. Thank you, Sir.

प्रधान मंत्री (श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी) : सभापति जी, मैं सभी माननीय सदस्यो को धन्यवाद देता हूं जिन्होने इस चर्चा मे भाग लिया है। कुछ मुद्दे उठाये गये थे जिनका उत्तर मेरे सहयोगी श्री यशवंत सिन्हा जी ने दिया है। विदेशी मामलो पर बहस एक महत्व रखती है। उससे प्रकट होता है कि देश के चिंतन की दिशा क्या है और अधिसंख्यक जनता क्या चाहती है। मैं बहुत दिनो तक विरोधी दल मे रहा तब श्री नटवर सिंह जी सत्ता पक्ष में थे, सत्ता पक्ष मे नही थे,

सत्ता मे थे, राजदूत के रूप में और मुझे याद है, अगर मैं गलती नही करता कि मेरे एक भाषण के बाद श्री नटवर सिंह जी ने मुझे एक पत्र लिखा था और उसमें मुझे बधाई भी दी थी मेरे भाषण के लिए कि आपने बहुत अच्छा भाषण दिया। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री के. नटवर सिंह : मैं आपको अब भी बधाई दे दूंगा, आप अच्छा भाषण दे दीजिए।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : नही, अब जरा बात बिगड़ गई है।

श्री सभापति : इनकी बधाई देने की आदत है, ये बधाई देंगे ही।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अब छोटा-सा सवाल उठाया जो कई बार उठाया जा चुका है। मुझे अच्छा नहीं लगता । राजीव गांधी हमारे बीच में नहीं हैं, हम सब उनका आदर करते हैं। वे चीन मे गए थे। मगर मैं उससे पहले चीन गया था और मेरे साथ चीन का जो समझौता हुआ था वह यह था कि सीमा पर peace और tranquility बनाई रखी जाएगी। जो, बाद मे श्री राजीव गांधी जब गए, उस समय दोहराया गया। अब कहा जाता है कि आपने राजीव गांधी का नाम नही लिया तो मैंने कहा कि राजीव गांधी ने मेरा नाम कब लिया था? लेकिन क्या डिबेट इस स्तर पर जाएगी? बहुत-सी बातें जो मैं पहले कहता था - राम जेठमलानी जी ठीक कह रहे हैं, वे मेरे व्यक्तित्व मे अब पुरानी झलक देखने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। वक्त बदल गया है। सबसे बड़ा परिवर्तन तो यह हुआ है। पहले मैं जनभावनाओं को प्रकट करता था और उन पर मैं अपना रंग भी चढ़ाता था। अब मैं जनभावनाओं को ध्यान में रखता हूं और राष्ट्रीयता का रंग चढ़ाकर हर सवाल को देखता हूं। अब कोई शिकायत कर सकता है। वह शिकायत जायज होगी कि आपने तिब्बत के बारे मे पहले क्या कहा था? हां, मैंने कहा था और मुझे पीड़ा है। लेकिन इस पीड़ा का मैं क्या करूं? इस पीड़ा को दूर करने का जो सबसे अच्छा उपाय हो सकता है, वह हमने निकालने की कोशिश की है। मैं फिर कहूंगा, इस बार मैं कोई दूर की कौड़ी नही लाना चाहता था। राजीव गांधी के साथ भी ऐसा हुआ था। उन्होने इस परिवर्तन को लिया था, इसका उल्लेख किया था। पहले तो हम कहते थे और इसका उल्लेख हो चुका है, मैं उसे दोहराऊं यह आवश्यक नही है - *"तिब्बतन रीजन इज़ पार्ट"* - इसमें *आटोनॉमस* नहीं था। पहली बार जब राजीव गांधी जी गए, उस समय जो वक्तव्य निकाला गया, उसमें यह बात कही गयी। इस बार भी इस बात पर जोर दिया गया है। अब इस बात को हम बार-बार कह भी नही सकते। तिब्बत रीजन बहुत बड़ा है और उसमे से एक *आटोनॉमस* रीजन है लेकिन यह फिर बहस को जन्म देने वाली बाते होगी, मैं इसमे जाना नही चाहता। किन्तु इसमे कोई मतभेद नही है, परिवर्तन है। जेठमलानी जी की तारीफ है कि अभी भी वे ऐसी बातो के समर्थन मे भाषण कर सकते हैं और अदालत मे पैरवी कर सकते हैं जिनको उन्होने पहले कभी नही माना और जिनके बारे मे वे पूरी जानकारी भी नही रखते हैं। लेकिन खड़े हो जाते हैं, वकीलो का यह गुण है। वे अच्छी वकालत करते हैं। केस अगर हारने वाला भी हो तो जीतने की संभावना बढ़ सकती है। लेकिन मुझे यह कहकर चिढ़ाना कि उस समय क्या कहा था? हां, कहा था। अब आप भूल गए? हां, भूल गए। आगे चलो। भविष्य की ओर देखो। कब तक हम इतिहास के बोझ को लादे हुए घूमते रहेंगे? इतिहास को तोड़ डालेंगे लेकिन इतिहास मे हम भूल-भुलैया मे फंस नही सकते। भविष्य बनाना है और भारत भविष्य के निर्माण के द्वार पर खड़ा है, यह मेरी इस यात्रा मे मैने देखा है। भारत के प्रभाव को अन्य देश स्वीकार कर रहे हैं, वे हमारी महत्ता समझ रहे हैं। वे यह भी जानते हैं कि भारत कुछ सिद्धांतो से बंधा हुआ है और उन सिद्धांतों पर दृढ़ रहेगा। हमारी इज्जत बढ़ेगी। सारे देश की

इज्जत बढ रही है, इसमे कोई मेरी इज्जत नही बढ रही है। मैं तो आज हूं, कल नही रहूंगा लेकिन जो भी प्रधान मंत्री आएगा उसका सम्मान होना चाहिए, इस अर्थ मे कि उसकी कही हुई बात को वजन दिया जाना चाहिए। मतभेद तो हो सकते हैं और मतभेदो को हम रौंदकर भी नही चलते, न ही मतभेदो की उपेक्षा करते हैं और न ही कोई चिढ़ाने वाली बात करते हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि इस दृष्टि से यह चर्चा सार्थक रही।

अरुणाचल के बारे मे जो कुछ कहा जा चुका है, उतना पर्याप्त है। मैं उसको दोहराना नही चाहता। हमारे और चीन के मतभेद हैं, परसेप्शन, लाइन ऑफ एक्चुअल कंट्रोल पर परसेप्शन मे मतभेद हैं और वे सामने आ गए। लेकिन जिस तरह से हमारे लोगो के स थ व्यवहार हुआ वह उस मर्यादा के अनुकूल नही है जिसका चीनियो ने स्वीकार किया था। इसकी ओर हमने उनका ध्यान दिलाया है। [illegible] अलग है, जो प्रतिपक्ष मे नही हैं लेकिन सरकार मे भी नही है, वे एक अलग दृष्टिकोण रखते हैं। इसकी भी जानकारी मिलती है। सब कम से कम इस मत के है कि भारत और चीन को साथ रहना चाहिए। भारत, चीन और रूस का नाम भी लिया जाता है। जब तीन विदेश मंत्रियो की बैठक हुई तो दुनिया के अनेक देशो ने नजर उठाकर सोचा कि यह हो क्या रहा है। कोई किसी के खिलाफ षड्यंत्र नही हो रहा था, किसी के विरुद्ध साजिश करने के लिए हम इकट्ठा नही हुए थे। मगर चीन, भारत और रशिया, जब इन देशो के मंत्री मिले तो दुनिया ने समझा कि एक नया रास्ता खुल रहा है। बात आगे ज्यादा नही बढ़ी क्योकि सब देशो ने ठीक तरह से परिवर्तन नही किया है अपनी नीतियो मे। समय लगेगा और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति हमे यह समझाती है कि जल्दी मत करिए, धीरे-धीरे चलिए। जल्दी छलांग लगाकर लाहौर पहुंच गए थे तो फिर कारगिल मे आना पड़ा था वापस। जब हमारे मित्र समझ गए हैं और जो विरोधी दल के नेता आए थे वे भी कह रहे थे कि हां, धीरे-धीरे होना चाहिए, धीरे-धीरे। हम धीरे-धीरे चले, मित्रता के साथ रहे। पाकिस्तान के साथ भारत की मित्रता हो, यह बहुत जरूरी है। हम मिलकर रहे तभी संसार की चुनौतियो का उत्तर दे सकते हैं। लेकिन मिलकर रहने का मतलब यह नही है कि हम आतंकवाद के साथ समझौता कर ले या आतंकवाद को दरकिनार कर दे, दरगुजर कर दे। आतंकवाद का मुकाबला करना होगा, उसको दृढ़ता के साथ कुचलना होगा और फिर मित्रता के हाथ बढ़ाकर, देश को और दोनों देशो को साथ-साथ ले जाकर अपनी गरीबी से लड़ने के खिलाफ प्रयत्न करना होगा। मैं समझता हूं कि हमारा यह उद्देश्य समान है और भारत और चीन इस दृष्टि से एक-दूसरे का सहयोग कर सकते है। डब्ल्यू टी.ओ. मे सपोर्ट करने की बात हुई है। मिलकर चलेगे, इसका प्रयत्न होगा और हम चीन के साथ और भी व्यापार संबंध बढ़ाने का ध्यान रख रहे हैं। बढ़ाने की बहुत गुंजाइश है लेकिन शक शुबहा दूर होने मे समय लगेगा और इसलिए उतावलापन ठीक नही है, मै यही कहना चाहता हूं। धन्यवाद।

श्री सभापति : बहुत, बहुत धन्यवाद। सदन की कार्रवाई कल ग्यारह बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned at thirty-nine minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 1st August, 2003

MGIPMRND—2904RS—17-3-2004.